REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1,4-6, 11-16 have been amended. Claims 1-16 are pending.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because the well-known acronym "EOB" was not spelled out for clarity when first introduced. Accordingly, the disclosure is amended to indicate that "EOB" is an acronym for "End of Block".

The Examiner objected to the presence of hyperlinks in the disclosure and required their deletion. To comply with Examiner's request, the disclosure is amended to delete the hyperlinks.

The Examiner objected to Claims 1-10, 12 and 16 because the acronym "EOB" was not spelled out for clarity when first used. To comply with Examiner's request, Claims 1,4,6 and 12 are rewritten to spell out "EOB" more clearly as "End of Block".

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner stated in pertinent part that "The Specification however lacks enablement since members (i.e. iDCT Normal, iDCT_high, iDCT_low, iDCT_AC, iDCT_DC) of the group (i.e. iDCT algorithms) have not been disclosed to possess at least one property in common which is mainly responsible for their function in the claimed relationship." Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 6 recited above overcome this rejection, since the amended independent Claims 1 and 6 no longer recite the above Markush group.

The Examiner stated that although the preamble of Claims 1 and 6 recite reducing iDCT execution time, the bodies of the Claims do "not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of such intended function." Accordingly, the preambles of Claims 1 and 6 are rewritten as recited above to more clearly state the features of the claimed invention.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2-5 and 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Regarding Claims 2,3,7 and 8, Examiner stated in pertinent part that "it is improper for dependent Claims 2,3,7 and 8, respectively, to add an element or step from Claim 1 which "consists of" recited elements". Accordingly, independent Claim 1 (from which Claims 2,3,7 and 8 depend) is rewritten to more clearly recite the features of the invention.

Regarding Claim 4, line 5, Examiner stated that "said EOB" shows no clear antecedent basis.

7

Accordingly, "said EOB" is rewritten in amended Claim 4 as "said EOB coefficient" to more clearly recite the claimed invention.

Regarding Claims 9 and 10, Examiner stated in pertinent part that "it is improper for dependent Claims 9 and 10, respectively, to add an element or step from Claim 6 which "consists of" recited elements". Accordingly, independent Claim 6 (from which Claims 9 and 10 depend) is rewritten to more clearly recite the features of the invention.

Per Examiner's suggestion regarding Claim 11, line 3, "iDCT" is inserted after "plurality of" in order to provide proper antecedent basis for the same as specified at line 2 of the Claim.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1,4,6 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Murata et al. Examiner stated in pertinent part that Murata discloses "selecting an iDCT algorithm from the set consisting of iDCT Normal, iDCT_high, iDCT_low, iDCT_AC, iDCT_DC (i.e., only one of the algorithms is required for anticipation under the Markush group[..])" Claims 1,4,6 and 11 have been amended to more clearly recite the features of the invention and as amended no longer recite a Markush group. Claim 13 is amended to delete iDCT_high and iDCT_low, since these two algorithms are now recited in amended independent Claim11 from which Claim 13 depends. Further, Applicant notes that Murata neither discloses nor suggests using an iDCT_high algorithm and/or using an iDCT_low algorithm.

The Examiner stated that Claims 5 and 14-16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims. Accordingly, Claims 5 and 14-16 have been rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base Claim and intervening Claims.

8

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Behfar Bastani-Booshehri
Registration No. 52,599

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300

9